

REMARKS

This Amendment Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §114 is being filed subsequent to, and is responsive to, a Final Rejection dated January 7, 2004 and concurrently with the aforementioned RCE. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicants would like to bring to the Examiner's attention that an Information Disclosure Statement was filed on March 8, 2004 and respectfully request that the Examiner confirm his consideration of the cited references by initialing and returning the PTO-1449 provided.

CLAIM STATUS

Claims 1-54 are listed on the Office Action Summary as pending. However, as acknowledged in ¶1 of the Office Action, by previous amendments, claims 7, 29, 51 and 53 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 18, 23, 25, 27 and 28 were amended. Thus, as a matter of record, claims 1-6, 8-28, 30-50, 52 and 54 are currently pending and have been rejected. Of these claims, claims 1 and 23 are independent in form.

By this Amendment, claims 2, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15 and 17 are amended, and claims 4, 6, 9, 10, 20, 21, 26, 28, 31, 32 and 41-43 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and 103

Claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-20, 22-27, 30-33, 35-42, 44-50, 52 and 54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Carbonell et al. (USP 6,163,785)("Carbonell"); claims 6 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

allegedly being unpatentable over Carbonell as applied to claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-20, 22-27, 30-33, 35-42, 44-50, 52 and 54 and in view of Motoyama (USP 6,208,956); claims 12 and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carbonell as applied to claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-20, 22-27, 30-33, 35-42, 44-50, 52 and 54 and in view of the previously cited Vitek et al. (USP 4,845,634)(“Vitek”); and claims 21 and 43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Carbonell as applied to claims 1-5, 8-11, 13-20, 22-27, 30-33, 35-42, 44-50, 52 and 54 and in view of Nigawara et al. (USP 5,771,043)(“Nigawara”).

Claims 4, 6, 9, 10, 20, 21, 26, 28, 31, 32 and 41-43 are herein canceled rendering the rejections as to these claims moot. Applicants request that the rejections as to these claims be withdrawn.

As will be explained in further detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 23, as amended, and the claims dependent therefrom, are not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, the cited art taken individually or in combination.

According to the present invention as recited in amended apparatus claim 1 and corresponding method claim 23, characters each included in verb, object and auxiliary words are separately input each to be retrieved in different databases. That is, for example, the verb word is retrieved in a database specific for a verb word and similarly, the object or auxiliary words. By doing this, as shown in Fig. 13 of the present application, and assuming by way of example the processing of a verb word, it is possible to shorten retrieval time because only the verb database is used to retrieve the verb word. Also because, in this example, all words to be retrieved are verb words and the number of words to be extracted is relatively small, it is possible to limit the range for performing the retrieval.

According to Carbonell, on the other hand, as described e.g., from line 30, column 20 to line 2, column 21 thereof, a non-CSL word is replaced with a new word if the non-CSL word is identified. For example in Carbonell, assuming the non-CSL word is “let”, words “allow, allowed, enable, enabled, permit, permitted, leave and left” are picked up as a substitute CSL word for the non-CSL word.

Comparing the present invention as recited in amended claims 1 and 23 with Carbonell, verb, object and auxiliary words are respectively and separately input to retrieve using different databases in the present invention, while a non-CSL word is extracted for an ambiguous and unconstrained text in Carbonell. That is, in Carbonell, verb, object and auxiliary words are *not* separately processed using different databases each which is specifically prepared for each word category.

In addition, a word physically including, e.g., “DOU”, which means “move”, is picked up when “DOU” is input for retrieval as shown in Fig. 13 of the present application, while a word physically including “let” is never extracted in Carbonell.

As discussed above, since Carbonell neither teaches nor suggests the elements of the present invention as in amended claims 1 or 23, that is, “input display” means/step, “retrieving” means/step and “selecting” means/step, Carbonell cannot achieve the technical features or attendant advantages of the present invention as explained above.

Accordingly, for at least the stated reasons, amended claims 1 and 23 are submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Carbonell, taken alone or in combination with the other art of record.

Dependent Claims

Applicants traverse the rejections of the dependent claims but have not independently addressed the rejections of the dependent claims because Applicants submit that the dependent claims are also allowable for at least similar reasons as stated for the independent claims from which they depend. Applicants however, reserve the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 23 as amended, and the claims depending therefrom, are not taught or suggested by, and neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious in view of, and thus patentably distinct over, Carbonell, Motoyama, Vitek or Nigawara, taken individually or in combination.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims as herein presented are allowable over the prior art of record, taken alone or in combination, and that the respective rejections be withdrawn. Applicants further submit that the application is hereby placed in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution of the instant application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

Applicants believe no fee nor extension of time is required for this filing. However, should an extension of time be necessary to render this filing timely, such extension is hereby petitioned, and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that

PATENT
S/N: 09/753,998

Docket No. 1232-4670


may be required for this paper, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 13-4500,

Order No. 1232-4670.

Respectfully submitted,
Morgan & Finnegan, L.L.P.

Dated: April 7, 2004

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stephen J. Manetta", is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized with a large initial 'S' and a trailing flourish.

Stephen J. Manetta
Reg. No. 40,426

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
345 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10154-0053
(212) 758-4800 (Telephone)
(212) 751-6849 (Telecopier)